



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

between 1619-30, David Jeshurun¹ appears as representative of the congregation Beth Israel (p. 38). In 1752 Isaac Jeshurun Lobo appears in the same capacity; in 1768 Israel ben Jacob; and in 1778 yet another Isaac Jeshurun (p. 39).

DAVID KAUFMANN.

A Conjecture on Job vi. 4.—In the last part of this verse the Massoretic text reads: **בְּעוֹתֵי אֱלֹהִים יַעֲרֹכֵנִי**. By the greater number both of ancient and modern commentators these words have been rendered, “the terrors of God do set themselves in array against me.” They assume that the verb **עָרַךְ** can be poetically construed with the direct accusative of the person. If so, Job vi. 4 would be the only example of such a use, and consequently Bickell (*Carmina Veteris Testamenti metrica*, p. 153), seems justified in saying, “Verbum *arakh* in significatione instruendi aciem cum accusativo hostis construi nequit.” Bickell, however, induced by his theory of Hebrew metre, adds here (as in very many other passages), words which are not found in the text. The LXX. has a very different interpretation. It translates **ὄταν ἀρξωμαι λαλεῖν, κεντοῦσι με**. The first part of this reading need not be here considered, because in the Massoretic text the words **בְּעוֹתֵי אֱלֹהִים** offer no difficulty. But the word **κεντοῦσι**, with which the LXX. translates the Hebrew **עָרַךְ**, is worthy of note. Merx, indeed, has accepted the LXX. verb, and substituted **יַעֲרֹקֵנִי** for **יַעֲרֹכֵנִי**. The verb **עָרַךְ** signifies *rodere*, *consumere*, and would give an acceptable meaning—“The terrors of God make me waste away.” But it seems to me that a better sense can be obtained by the slight change of the Massoretic text into **יַעֲרֹכֵנִי** from the verb **עָכַר** *conturbare*. We then get a much more vivid and poetical image: “The terrors of God confound me.” This conjecture only consists in the transposition of two letters, and it is strongly supported by the Peshito, which reads: **ובעתה ראלהא סררתני**, “Et terror Dei me perterrituit.” The Syriac verb **סָרַר**, in the Pael form, can be most properly rendered in Hebrew by **עָכַר**, but certainly not by **עָרַךְ**.

D. CASTELLI.

When did the Jews first settle in England?—I observe that in the *English Historical Review* (October, 1888), Dr. Neubauer takes me to task for stating in my lecture on the London Jewry, that the Jews came over to this country with the Conqueror. He quotes Theod. *Panitentialis*, and the Laws of Edward the Confessor, as proving that Jews lived here before the conquest. I need scarcely say I was fully aware of the existence of these passages which were duly noted and briefly abstracted in the Bibliography of Anglo-Jewish history, drawn up by Mr. L. Wolf and myself for the Committee of the Anglo-Jewish Exhibition (No. 3, *Ancient Laws*). But I advisedly disregarded the inference which previous inquirers had drawn from these passages, and Dr. Neubauer now endorses. As the point is of some interest and importance, and can be made to lead up to a novel aspect of a well-known episode in early English history, I should like to put at length the reasons of my position.

It will be necessary to have before us the short titles of the laws referred to. I may, therefore, repeat the entries given in the *Bibl. Anglo-Judaica*, numbering them for convenience of reference.

¹ Kayserling, 177 *seq.*

Anglo-Saxon Laws—

(1.) All Jews under king's protection.—*Edw. Conf.*, c. xxv.

Monumenta Ecclesiastica—

(2.) If a Christian woman fornicate with Jews or Pagans.—*Th. P.*, xvi. 35.

(3.) If any one celebrate Passover with the Jews.—*Th. P.*, xxx. 4.

(4.) If any Christian accept unleavened bread or any food or drink from Jews.—*Th. P.*, xli. 1.

(5 and 6.) If any Christian sell another to Jews.—*Ibid.*, 3, *Ecq. E.* 150.

(7.) Mass not to be celebrated where Jews or Pagans are buried.—*Th. P.*, xlvii. 1.

(8.) That no Christian turn Jew.—*Ecq. E.*, 147, 150.

Now as regards (1), the so-called Laws of Edward the Confessor were really drawn up by William the Conqueror, and, therefore, cannot be quoted for the condition of affairs before his time. The exact date is 1069 (Cf. G. Masson, *Dawn of French Lit.*, p. 125). And with regard to the particular clause relating to the Jews, there is great probability that it is an interpolation *temp.* Henry II. Sir Henry Spelman distinctly notes this in his edition of the Laws, and Selden omits it, for the same reason, in his notes on *Ædmer*. (See Webb, *The Question*, &c., pp. 30-3, and Appendix No. 23, where the point is fully discussed). In the little book on the Jews in Early England, which I am preparing for Mr. York-Powell's series "English History from Contemporary Sources," I have accordingly placed the law under the reign of the second Henry.

There remain only the ecclesiastical provisions. Now of these (3) and probably (4) do not refer to Jews personally, but rather to Jewish practices about Easter, on which there was a burning quarrel in the mediæval Church, whether Easter should be held on the same day as the Jewish Passover or not. (See Appendix V. to Mayor and Lumby's edition of Bede.) With reference to this, Bede calls the dissenting parties "Judaisers" (*ibid.*, p. 72). And the other provisions may have only been copied into the ecclesiastical code from similar Continental collections. This is especially mentioned as regards (8), which is headed "A Laodicean Canon." All the outside evidence, positive and negative, is against these provisions being directed against Jewish residents in Anglo-Saxon England. There is no reference to Jews in Bede or in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles (till 1144). The rich collection of charters in the six volumes of Kemble's *Codex Diplomaticus* has not a single reference to Jews. The only charter of Anglo-Saxon times which does refer to them is contained in Ingulph's *Chronicle of Croyland* (p. 9, ed. Gale), now recognised to be a forgery. And the positive evidence of the late settlement is equally conclusive. William of Malmesbury (*Gesta*, ed. Hardy, p. 500), says: "The Jews who dwelt in London whom his [Rufus] father had brought from Rouen." Fuller dates their advent in Cambridge in 1073 (*History of Cambridge*, p. 8). Anthony à Wood fixes their arrival in Oxford definitely at 9 William I. (1075, ed. Gutch, i. 129). There is only a single reference to a Jew in Domesday, if the Manasses mentioned in the Oxford survey is a Jew. Altogether, everything combines to justify William of Malmesbury's statement, and to confirm my dating the first settlement of the Jews in London, and therefore in England, at about 1070, notwithstanding the isolated and only apparently conflicting evidence of the ecclesiastical provisions.

For when examined closely, these do not necessarily apply to Jewish residents in England, even if they were intended for actual application at all. Nos. 2, 5, 6, 7, 8 would equally apply to passing visitors, and, above all, to slave merchants, and I am inclined to think actually did so apply.

For if we reflect on the economic conditions of England in Anglo-Saxon times, there was no room in the national economy for persons like Jews, who could not join the guilds, and had no scope for usury in a country living almost entirely by barter (Ashley, *English Commentary*, I. i., c. i. § 6, p. 43). The chief export of England consisted of slaves (*ibid.*, p. 70), and we know that the Jews were the great dealers in this class of commodity. It is accordingly significant that in the later code of Egberht, (c. A.D. 760), the only two provisions about Jews (6 and 8) dealt with their purchase of slaves, and their proselytising zeal, which we know applied to their slaves—a trait of some interest, as it implies a humane interest in their human chattels. Altogether, therefore, I am inclined to refer the ecclesiastical ordinances to passing intercourse with Gallo-Jewish slave-dealers, and not to any permanent Jewish population of England before the Conquest.

I would bring this conclusion into connection with a famous episode in our annals. Every one remembers the incident at the market-place of Rome, which led to the Christianising of England, and brought it into the European concert. Now we find the very same Gregory, when he became Pope, complaining of the sale of Christian slaves to Jewish slave-dealers in the north of Gaul (*Epistola*, ix. 35, 109, 110), and it requires very little stretch of imagination to suppose that they likewise crossed the Channel. Remembering that slaves have no nationality, I would therefore suggest that if Gregory had stated the prosaic fact in his world-famous remarks about the chubby, blond-haired lads exposed for sale on the Roman slave-market, he would have said, "*Non Angli nec angeli sed—Judæorum servi.*"

JOSEPH JACOBS.

Shanah.—In his interesting article on "The New Year and its Liturgy" in the first number of *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, Mr. M. Friedmann states that the substantive *shanah* "year," is derived from *shanah*, "to repeat." Enough is now known of Semitic phonetics, however, to enable us to say with certainty that *shanah* "year" is derived from a stem *shanah*, which means "to change," while שנים, "two," is derived from *shanah*, "to repeat." A study of the corresponding Aramaean forms, not to speak of other cognate languages, makes this point clear. (Compare *Hebraica*, vol. I., p. 220.)

CYRUS ADLER.

Tobit's Dog.—The Greek version of the Apocrypha states that when Tobiah was on his journey to Rages, the "young man's dog" went with him. But the dog was not regarded among Eastern peoples with feelings of affection. It seems, therefore, highly improbable that Tobiah was actually accompanied by a dog. The Hebrew and Chaldee versions of the text entirely omit the dog incident. Can its presence in the Greek version be accounted for? Now, the original language of the Book of Tobit was, despite Prof. Nöldeke's opinion to the contrary, probably Hebrew or Chaldee. This supplies the clue to our difficulty. Tobiah was directed by Raphael to extract the heart of the fish that he caught, as well as (the liver and) the gall. It was *the heart* (הלב), and not *a dog* (כלב) that the young man took with him. My suggestion relies on a very simple mis-reading. The word *הלב* occurs several times in this part of the narrative, and a careless copyist might easily have made the slip I suppose to have occurred.

I. A.